

REMARKS

Examiner Carter is thanked for the careful examination of this application and favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1, 18, 25 and 31 being the only independent claims.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,198,552 to *Nagae*.

Nagae discloses a color image processing system having a color image information input device 11-1, a color image information output device 11-n, an inherent color space-to-common color space conversion feature 13-1 and a common color space-to-inherent color space conversion feature 13-n. The inherent color space-to-common color space conversion feature 13-1 converts color data expressed in a color space inherent to the input device 11-1 into data expressed in the uniform color space (for example, Lab space or XYZ space), and the common color space-to-inherent color space conversion feature 13-n converts data expressed in the uniform color space into data expressed in a color space inherent to an output device 12-n included in the color image information output device 11-n. Thus, the output device 11-n in *Nagae* includes a conversion feature for converting the common color image data (Lab or XYZ) into color image data expressed in a given color space inherent to the color image information output device.

An aspect of the claimed invention that is generally defined by Claims 1, 18, 25 and 31 is generally directed to color management and includes, among other features, obtaining a plurality of color reproduction regions from at least two output

devices, generating a common color reproduction region included in any of the plurality of color reproduction regions, and restricting the range of color information included in image data to the common color reproduction region before the image data is handled.

Nagae does not anticipate the feature generally directed to obtaining a plurality of color reproduction regions from at least two output devices. The Official Action proposes that this feature is disclosed in Figure 1 and column 9, lines 39-45 of *Nagae*, however, these cited portions of *Nagae* disclose that “[e]ach of the devices receives color image data expressed in the Lab space and reproduces an image. It is also conceivable that a system enabling use of color image data expressed in a plurality of color spaces is realized by employing a conversion feature for converting the XYZ space into Lab space or vice versa.” See column 9, lines 39-45 (emphasis added). As noted earlier, *Nagae* converts the image data in the common color space to the reproduction region of the particular device, but at no point obtains a plurality of color reproduction regions from at least two output devices. With respect to these sections of *Nagae* noted above, converting image data in Lab space and reproducing an image, and converting XYZ space to Lab space and vice versa, is not obtaining a reproduction region as defined by the claims. Therefore, *Nagae*’s process does not disclose obtaining a plurality of color reproduction regions from at least two output devices together with the other claimed features.

Nagae also fails to disclose the feature generally directed to generating a common color reproduction region included in any of the plurality of color reproduction regions. The Official Action proposes that this feature is disclosed in Figure 1, and column 9, lines 45-48 of *Nagae*, however, these cited portions of

Nagae merely disclose that each device includes a conversion feature for converting color image data expressed in a color space inherent to the input device into color image data expressed in a given color space (Lab data or RGB data respectively). The uniform color space does not include any of a plurality of reproduction regions of the output devices as defined by the claims. Nowhere in *Nagae* is generation of a common color reproduction region as defined by the claims disclosed. This is further evidenced by *Nagae*'s conversion feature 13-n for converting image data in Lab space to image data inherent to the color space of the output device. If the image data was in a common color reproduction region this would not be necessary.

Further, *Nagae* fails to disclose the feature generally directed to restricting a range of color information included in image data to the common color reproduction region before the image data is handled. As noted earlier, *Nagae* does not disclose a common color reproduction region and therefore does not disclose the above noted feature. Also, the Official Action proposes that the feature at issue is disclosed in Figures 17 a-b, and column 19, line 55 through column 20, line 8 of *Nagae*, however, this portion of *Nagae* merely discloses compression of a lightness level of a color domain of image data. The compression feature 95 carries out processing (handling) so that a range of levels of lightness specified in color image data will be matched (restricted) within a range of levels of lightness of the output device. The processing of the data (handling) cannot be considered to take place after the data is matched (restricted) to a range of levels of lightness of the output device. Therefore, *Nagae* clearly does not disclose the feature directed to restricting a range of color information included in image data to the common color reproduction region before the image data is handled together with the other features of the claimed invention.

The differences between the features disclosed in *Nagae* and the claimed features at issue are further evidence by the fact that the claimed common color reproduction region allows image data to be in a color region common to all the output devices, thereby eliminating a need for each output device to individually convert the image data. *Nagae* discloses the opposite, i.e., individual processing of uniform image data (Lab or XYZ) for each output device to produce image information for the reproduction region of that particular device.

Claim 2 defines that there are only two output devices. This feature is not disclosed by *Nagae*. Column 9, lines 37-41 (emphasis added) recite that “[w]hen serving as an input device, each of devices 1-1, 1-p, 1-q, and 1-n outputs color image data expressed in the Lab space. When serving as an output device, each of the devices receives color image data expressed in the Lab space and reproduces an image.” Thus, there are four output devices, 1-1, 1-p, 1-q and 1-n. For at least this reason, Claim 2 is allowable.

Claim 6 defines that the means for generating a common color reproduction region further generate another common color reproduction region. As *Nagae* does not disclose generating a first common color reproduction region, as noted earlier, another common color reproduction region is also not disclosed for the same reasons as set forth earlier.

Claim 9 defines a means for detecting an output device connected in the plurality of output devices. This feature is not disclosed by *Nagae*. The Official Action points toward column 23, lines 12-15 of *Nagae* to disclose such, however, this portion of *Nagae* only recites that “when color information concerning a device is appended to an image, a device for producing a final output can be changed from

one to another or an approximate output of the final output can be produced.”

Nowhere is a means for detecting an output device disclosed in this portion of *Nagae*.

It is not apparent how the Official Action proposes this portion of *Nagae* to disclose the above-noted feature of the claimed invention. Thus, should this rejection be maintained, it is respectfully requested that it be more clearly pointed out how this portion of *Nagae* is interpreted as disclosing the above noted feature, thereby affording an opportunity to adequately respond to this rejection, or that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 17 defines that the means for generating the common color reproduction region approximates the common color reproduction region to a polyhedron, which by definition is three dimensional. The Official Action points to Figure 18B of *Nagae* to disclose this feature, however, Figure 18B only has two dimensions, a and b. Therefore, Figure 18B does not disclose a polyhedron and Claim 17 is allowable.

Claims 2-17, 19-24 and 26-30 depend from allowable independent Claims 1, 18, 25 and 31 and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regard to Claims 1, 18, 25 and 31.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claims 1-36 are allowable.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 5, 2004

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620